

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

JUDY PEATROWSKY, an individual,

Case No. 2:12-cv-00935-MMD-VCF

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

PERSOLVE, a limited liability company,  
and DOES 1-10,

Defendants.

Before the Court is the verified petition by Edit Alexandryan for permission to be admitted to practice pro hac vice.

The filings relating to counsel's petition are reflected in the docket and are too numerous to recount here. (See dkt. nos. 38, 40, 47, 51, 54, 59, and 61.) Plaintiff filed a response objecting to the initial petition found at docket no. 38. (See dkt. no. 39.) The Court denied the petition and the second petition (dkt. no. 40), which only corrected one deficiency, for failure to comply with LR IA 10-2 and LR IA10-1(b)(1). (See dkt. no. 41.) After counsel filed the last petition (dkt. no. 47), the Court identified additional questions and ordered counsel to supplement her petition within 7 days. (See dkt. no. 50.) Counsel filed a notice of corrected image and identified the missing information in response to the Court's questions. (Dkt. no. 51.) On May 3, 2013, about two months after plaintiff's response to her initial petition and after the Court denied the initial and second petitions, counsel filed a "reply" to plaintiff's response without seeking

1 leave of Court.<sup>1</sup> (See dkt. no. 59.) The numerous deficiencies in the petitions and the  
2 late filed “reply” demonstrate that counsel is either not familiar with the Court’s local  
3 rules or is cavalier about complying with them.

4 Local Rule IA (“Rule”) 10-2 outlines the requirements and procedures for an  
5 attorney who is not a member of the Nevada Bar to seek admission to practice in a  
6 particular case. Rule 10-2(a)(5) requires counsel to associate “an active member in  
7 good standing of the State Bar of Nevada as counsel of record.” Rule 10-1(b) requires  
8 that an attorney who is admitted to practice in Nevada but who does not maintain an  
9 office in Nevada must “either associate a licensed Nevada attorney maintaining an  
10 office in Nevada or designate a licensed Nevada attorney maintaining an office in  
11 Nevada” for purposes of service. Rule 10-1(b)(1) clarifies that “[a] post office box or a  
12 mail drop location shall not constitute an office under this rule.” Rules 10-1(b) and 10-2  
13 combined require that the Nevada local counsel must not only be licensed but must also  
14 maintain an office in Nevada. The purpose of these rules is to ensure that counsel from  
15 out of state associate with local counsel who is familiar with the court’s rules of practice  
16 and procedures. An attorney who is licensed in Nevada and maintains an office in  
17 Nevada would presumably do some work in the state so the Court can presume some  
18 familiarity with the Court’s local rules and practice.

19 Ms. Alexandryan claims that her designated Nevada local counsel, Alaine Patti-  
20 Jelsvik, who is also employed with Defendant, maintains an office at the Nevada  
21 address designated in her petition where Ms. Patti-Jelsvik “receives her mail for Nevada  
22 matters.” (Dkt. no. 59 at 4.) In her declaration, Ms. Patti-Jelsvik asserts that she uses  
23 her Nevada address to receive service of documents and mail, and as daily mail is  
24 received, a copy is forwarded to her via email and the hard copy sent to her by mail.


25  
26  
27 <sup>1</sup>The title of the “reply” references plaintiff’s objection to Ms. Alexandryan’s third  
28 and fourth petitions (dkt. nos. 47 and 51). However, the “reply” is docketed as a reply to  
plaintiff’s response to the initial petition (dkt. no. 40), which was the only response filed  
by plaintiff.

1 (Dkt. no. 59-2.) She does not claim to maintain the Nevada address for any purpose  
2 other than to receive mail.

3 Merely having a physical office where an attorney can receive mail does not  
4 amount to maintaining an office for the purpose of Rule 10-1(b), otherwise, an attorney  
5 can circumvent this rule by renting an office to receive mail as Ms. Patti-Jelsvik has  
6 done here. Ms. Patti-Jelsvik's Nevada address is indistinguishable from a drop box or a  
7 post office address. Indeed, the fact that counsel exhibits such a lack of familiarity with  
8 respect to the court's local rules as noted above only further demonstrates that the goal  
9 behind Rule 10-1(b) is thwarted if counsel can associate with a Nevada licensed  
10 attorney who has an office in the state solely to receive mail. Accordingly, Ms.  
11 Alexandryan's petition files to comply with Rules 10-2 and 10-1(b) and is denied.

12 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Edith Alexandryan's petition for permission  
13 to practice (dkt. nos. 38, 40, 47 and 50) is denied. Counsel is given another fifteen (15)  
14 days to submit an amended petition that complies with Rules 10-2 and 10-1(b).

15 DATED THIS 21<sup>st</sup> day of May 2013.

16  
17   
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 MIRANDA M. DU  
20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28